

Appendix C

Feedback from Customers	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customers like the familiarity of having the same member of staff on site and feel that this gives the staff a sense of responsibility and pride in the site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recognised that familiarity for both staff and customers is extremely important. It has always been the intention to give staff regular sites. Each option would allow for day shift staff to be based at a regular site, this would allow staff to become familiar with the site, it's residents and other YHN staff working in the area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customers prefer to have staff on site at night, both at current 24 hour and resident sites as they are available to assist with 'falls, strokes and when stuck in lifts' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst it is recognised that customers would prefer to have staff on site at night there is no evidence to support this. Activity analysis has shown that the quietest time on sites is during the night, very few incidents or customer contact is recorded Staff who currently reside on resident sites are not required to remain on site after the end of their shift, therefore the services that some customers have come to rely on can not be guaranteed. Whilst staff do respond to customers if they are available, staff have feedback that it can be inconvenient and feel obliged to respond. Customers have been advised to utilise the 0800 number out of hours and signposted to services such as CCAS if they feel at risk of strokes or falls Options 2 and 3 would guarantee a service to customers out of hours. All customers would have direct contact

	<p>with the control room(s) via their intercom to enable them to gain assistance at any time. They would also still have access to the 0800 number should they wish to use it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifts on current resident sites currently have an alarm which is linked back to CCAS. Should Option 2 or 3 be progressed the lift would also have a camera and be linked back to the control room(s.) This would ensure that anyone trapped in a lift would be noticed immediately and a reassurance provided via the communications system
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would happen to existing Resident Concierge and their properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident Concierge would be given the option to reside in their current properties or move out. If they chose to move out they would be given the opportunity to apply for Council accommodation via Your Choice Homes • If the properties became vacant they would become part of the housing stock and available for rent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over increase in tailgating, Anti Social Behaviour and void levels if staff aren't on site all of the time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst ASB and tailgating will never completely be eradicated, the existing methods of dealing with them will continue in all options. In Options 2 and 3 tailgating would be dealt with consistently across all sites. IT systems would highlight people attempting to gain access through repeatedly pressing buttons on door access systems and draw operators attention to the site. They

	<p>would then be able to challenge tailgaters by audio systems both on door access panels and with foyers and lifts. Should tailgaters persist in attempting to access the block the police would be called and response staff despatched to site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those customers living on current resident sites would benefit from Options 2 or 3 as CCTV and door access would be monitored 24 hours a day • ASB would be more identifiable under Options 2 and 3, technical systems would be monitored by more staff than at present. Should ASB occur the police would be called or responsive staff would be despatched, allowing the source of noise complaints to be identified etc • Under option 2 and 3 responsive staff would be available 24 hours and would undertake regular patrols of sites between other tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that cameras would be installed then couldn't be used because of challenges over lack of privacy. Without staff to identify problems, customers were worried that incidents would not be picked up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional camera locations have been identified for existing resident sites. These would be installed under Options 2 and 3. Consideration has been given to the number of cameras and locations, and they would be placed on ground floors and entrance ways to ensure that any people accessing sites have to pass at least one camera, ensuring that their image is captured, whilst

	maintaining customers privacy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YHN will be neglecting their duty of care to tenants if they implement any of the centralised options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is believed that by implementing Options 2 or 3 customers safety will be improved as CCTV and door access systems would be monitored centrally by at least 4 staff at any time, in addition to the CCTV and door access systems, customers at existing resident sites would also benefit from having their smoke and intruder alarms monitored as those on current 24 hour sites • By providing all customers with direct access to centralised control room(s) under Options 2 and 3 the service will be able to respond to emergencies by despatching responsive staff. At present only 1 member of staff is available to response to issues after 7pm at night as all other staff are confined to their lodges within 24 hour sites and resident staff have no obligation to be available
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that the network won't be stable enough and customers will be left without service provision if it goes down 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fibre network has been recommended to ensure stability. Under Option 2 a 'reserve' control room is planned for Cruddas Park House to ensure that services can be maintained should the main control room not be operational. In addition to ensuring the function of the control room, responsive staff would be available to assist on sites which lose any functionality. Should the system

	fail entirely, each block will be capable of working alone
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about where the funding is coming from for the changes as the technology will be expensive to upgrade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is anticipated that the funding for the review will be met from prudential borrowing. The cost of the borrowing would not be passed onto to the customer. It is envisaged that the borrowing would be paid back within an estimated 10 years based on efficiencies in establishment only
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current intercoms have no volume control and are not accessible for those with hearing difficulties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intercoms available in Options 2 and 3 have a volume control and visible alert. They also would contain the key pad for the intruder alarm to negate the need for a separate key pad
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about the service charge increasing – residents feel they will be getting a lower level of service at a higher charge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst the estimated service charges appear to show the cost of the service increasing, they are the total cost of the service leaving no subsidy to be met from the HRA. At Management Team in June it was agreed that any increase in charge for customers would continue to be met from the HRA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about affordability based on the estimated charges. People feel that those who are working and pay full rent will be forced out of concierge blocks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of options were submitted to board in February 2009, Board approved Options 1, 2 and 3 to be progressed as the other options did not deliver the drivers for the review

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents felt that the review is being done 'to them' and that they haven't been given real choice. Why were there only three options and who chose them? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has been agreed that leaseholders will be charged for the services apportioned to their block. The introduction of mobile and resourcing technology will provide accurate information detailing the time staff have spent on individual sites allowing charges to be demonstrated
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customers felt that they should be able to choose the best service for their block rather than 'one size fits all' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff will be able to monitor all cameras as monitors will be set up to display images only when there is movement on the screen. There will also be a minimum of 4 staff on duty within the control room(s) at any time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leaseholders feel they should only pay for the service which they receive and should have choice on the level of service they get 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The good neighbour role will continue to be provided but will be more flexible under options 2 and 3 due to staff not being confined to lodges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leaseholders felt treated unfairly – they were unable to make a decision in the consultation because there was no information about how much they will pay due to change over to an unpooled charging system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without systems being upgraded and the blocks linked to a network the changes can not take place
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns that staff won't be able to monitor all of the cameras from one location and that some incidents will be missed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to staff being on site during the day in all options response times will be minimal. During the night response times will be improved as currently there is only

	<p>one member of staff on duty to cover the city as all others are confined to their lodges. It is planned to agree response times for different types of incidents with customers prior to the changes being implemented</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers like the good neighbour role currently provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The good neighbour role will continue to be provided but will be more flexible under options 2 and 3 due to staff not being confined to lodges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that change will go ahead without the technology being upgraded, leading to poor services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without systems being upgraded and the blocks linked to a network the changes can not take place
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over the response times as little information on numbers of staff on duty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to staff being on site during the day in all options response times will be minimal. During the night response times will be improved as currently there is only one member of staff on duty to cover the city as all others are confined to their lodges. It is planned to agree response times for different types of incidents with customers prior to the changes being implemented
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers were keen to see responsive staff patrolling sites whilst on duty rather than waiting for calls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was planned that responsive staff within all options would work proactively around the city. When not tasked with a specific job they would be expected to attend sites to undertake spot checks. They would also be tasked proactively to those areas with a higher number of incidents in a bid to deter and prevent ASB.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception that services will be lost or decline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was never the intention to remove or reduce services. The implementation of Options 2 and 3 is believed to provide more flexible, proactive services on site whilst maintaining the security of the blocks. Introducing Options 2 or 3 would also provide the same level of service across the city, combining on site services currently enjoyed on current resident sites with the security of existing 24 hour blocks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers would like to see the building cleaning brought in house 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Options 2 and 3 the building cleaning would be brought in house. Discussions have taken place with Neighbourhood Services to amend the service level agreement to remove the multi storey blocks. The building cleaning would be undertaken by on site staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional services which customer would like are Environmental - litter picking, planting flowers, weeding, assisting with the removal of furniture General Cleaning Duties – cleaning of all communal areas, cleaning of windows both internally and externally at the entrances, cleaning to include floors and communal seating, regular chute and bin cleaning Security – Be a visible presence to alleviate anti social behaviour and the fear of crime, report any incidents and prevent tailgating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the additional services requested will be possible with the correct training for staff. Some of the services requested are already provided either by the Concierge Service or by other services. Marketing of the services will be revisited to ensure that customers are aware of the services available

<p>Repairs and Maintenance – Provision of a handy man service and retain keys for customers properties</p> <p>Develop good neighbour role – Provide welfare assistance to customers and assist vulnerable customers</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customers would like to see a more proactive approach to tackling ASB within blocks and an improved allocations policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the drivers for the review was partnership with other services such as the police. By creating better links with the police and other services the National Intelligence Model can be used to target resources, benefitting both Concierge Service customers and those on the surrounding estates The allocations policy is not something that can be influenced by the review but the feedback will be passed onto Your Choice Homes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defensible space around blocks would be beneficial as people would feel safer and it would act as a deterrent to ASB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defensible space was not within the scope of the review but the feedback will be passed on
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communal areas would require investment as many are dark and not particularly inviting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decoration did not fall under the scope of the review but can be dealt with under the painting programme. Furniture etc would need to be researched and funded separately
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notices boards would be beneficial to customers so they would know which member of staff was on duty and how 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The costs for Options 2 and 3 have electronic notice boards included for all blocks, these boards would be

<p>to contact them</p>	<p>programmable centrally and would contain information on staff who are on duty, contact details, repair information etc. The screens would also be used to advertise latest YHN initiatives, adverts and could be used by TARAs to advertise meetings</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suggestion box for complaints and compliments, suggestions and concerns would be beneficial when staff are not on site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion boxes could be placed in foyers for customer comments, complaints and compliments, but in Options 2 and 3, information and help points will be placed in the foyers of all blocks allowing customers to contact the Concierge Service at anytime, customers would also be able to make comments etc directly to staff within the control room(s) from their properties via their intercoms
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers would also like to see a fourth option considered for existing 24 hour sites, this option would have on site staff during the day carrying out general duties such as cleaning, removal of rubbish and good neighbour duties, CCTV to be monitored centrally and nightshift staff to be based on site when customers feel most vulnerable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the same as Option 1 plus the CCTV being monitored 24 hours a day from a centralised point. This option would be more expensive than Option 1 as the control room would have to be permanently staffed. It would also not deliver the drivers for the review, as it would not address the cost of the service or the current structure and associated management issues